City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 13, 2012

Attendees:

Steve Langworthy, ART Chair/Director of Land Use and Long Range Planning; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Director of Building Standards; Michael Clarey, Economic Development Administrator; Dan Phillabaum, Senior Planner; Justin Goodwin, Planner II, Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; John DeJarnette, Police Lieutenant and Ebony Mills, Office Assistant II.

12-063ARB-BPR – BSC Historic Core District – North Riverview Street Mixed-Use Redevelopment – Demolition and Basic Plan Review – 40 Blacksmith Lane – 53 North Riverview Street

Dan Phillabaum noted that the agenda had a special presentation on the Demolition Conditions programmed for the end of the meeting, but he would provide an overview of the Conditions as part of the introduction of this application to the Administrative Review Team (ART) members. He stated that the applicant was unable to attend this meeting, but was planning to attend the Administrative Review Team meeting on Thursday, September 27 to answer any questions the ART members may have prior to a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board on October 4.

Mr. Phillabaum said this is a request for approval of the demolition of six existing residential structures located on the west side of North Riverview Street between Bridge Street and North Street on six parcels zoned BSC Historic Core District. He said as part of the request for demolition, the applicant is requesting review of a mixed-use development proposal including restaurant, retail, office, and residential uses under a Basic Plan Review. He said this is a request for demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and for review of a Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).

Mr. Phillabaum provided an overview of the site, including the six existing structures and two parcels located on the east side of North Riverview Street adjacent to the Scioto River, and the surrounding development context. He noted that the Basic Plan Review application, outlining the proposal for a mixed use development project, has been submitted to respond to the fourth condition for demolition.

Steve Langworthy pointed out that there were two parcels on the river that the applicant was proposing to either sell or dedicate to the City if there was interest in extending the Dublin Spring Park farther north along the Scioto River.

Fred Hahn said that the City would be very interested in those parcels for an extension of the park.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that there are two components of the request for Demolition Review under Code. He said that the applicant must either demonstrate that there is economic hardship or unusual and compelling circumstances associated with maintaining the existing structures, *or* demonstrate that two of four conditions for demolition have been met. He said he would describe each condition for the ART members and provide an overview of the information presented by the applicant to demonstrate that the condition has been met. The applicant has elected to provide supporting documentation for both economic hardship as well as all four of the alternative conditions.

Mr. Phillabaum stated that the first condition is that *the structure contains no features of architectural and historic significance to the character of the area in which it is located*. He said that the applicant has provided background data about the character and condition of each of the structures.

Mr. Langworthy commented that the key phrases in this condition are *architectural and historic significance*. He said that the ART members could consider this condition as it relates to each particular structure, or to the structures as a group.

Jeff Tyler asked if any of the structures were on the National Register. Mr. Phillabaum answered that none were. Mr. Tyler asked if any of the structures were on the Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI). Mr. Phillabaum reported that all of them were.

Mr. Hahn asked if anyone could add any older structure to the OHI. Mr. Phillabaum said they could, and the City may have added these structures as part of a "sweep" of the Historic District at some point in the past. Mr. Hahn asked if there was any statement of historical significance noted on the OHI registration for any of these structures. Mr. Phillabaum said he did not recall if there were any statements like that in the inventories, and would distribute copies of the OHI inventories for these properties to the ART as well as to the applicant.

Mr. Langworthy commented that, to some extent, the first condition looks at each of the structures individually, while the fourth condition addresses the structures as a group. He said, in fact, when this application was reviewed as a Concept Plan by the Architectural Review Board, Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council, there was some discussion about whether the north portion of the Historic District has developed to the point that it may no longer be appropriate for residential uses in this part of the Historic District.

Barb Cox inquired if the discussion referred to the appropriateness of *single-family detached* residential uses, since higher density residential development as part of a mixed use development is consistent with the plans for this area.

Mr. Tyler asked if there had been any CIP funds programmed for the improvement of North Riverview Street, and if any improvements had been made in the past few years. Ms. Cox commented that the last major improvement was stormwater system upgrades, but that has been over ten years. Mr. Hahn said that there weren't any funds programmed in the current CIP.

Ms. Cox asked if the applicant was required to submit separate applications for each property, or if it was acceptable for the lots to be submitted as part of a single application. Mr. Langworthy said that the sites could be submitted together, because theoretically, the Architectural Review Board could find that certain conditions could be met for some of the lots or structures, but not for others. He noted that the applicant had also provided information for each structure individually.

Ms. Cox asked if the applicant had tried to sell any of the homes, and if there were any interior photos of the structures. Mr. Phillabaum said that the property owners had not, since they had been assembling the

properties over the years for the purposes of a larger scale redevelopment project, and that was a big part of the reason why these sites were shown to be redeveloped in both the 2007 Community Plan and in the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Plan. He said that the applicant had not submitted any interior photos.

Mr. Phillabaum said that the second condition states *that there is no reasonable economic use for the structure as it exists or as it might be restored, and that there exists no feasible and prudent alternative to demolition.* He noted that the applicant had submitted comparable sales and market data for this proposal.

Mr. Langworthy said that the key part of this condition is whether there is a reasonable economic use as the structures *exist or as restored*, and that there is *no alternative to demolition.*

Ms. Cox noted that the structures *could* be moved, but it would be very expensive, and very challenging with the grades.

Mr. Phillabaum continued that the third condition is that *deterioration has progressed to the point where it is not economically feasible to restore the structure and such neglect has not been willful*. He reported that the applicant had provided information demonstrating that the structures have not been neglected, and that improvements have been made to make the structures habitable as rental dwelling units.

Mr. Langworthy added that the *cost of restoration* should be considered with respect to this condition. Mr. Tyler said that it would be helpful to have more specific examples of the costs to improve the structures. He said that the applicant had submitted some general cost estimates, but in order to appropriately understand the applicant's understanding of *economic feasibility* as it pertains to this condition, more information would be helpful.

Mr. Phillabaum concluded that the fourth condition is that *the location of the structure impedes the orderly development, substantially interferes with the Purposes of the District, or detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity; or, the proposed construction to replace the demolition significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District*. He said that the applicant's application for Basic Plan Review had been submitted to provide documentation in support of this condition, demonstrating that the development proposal to replace the existing residences is consistent with the City's overall vision for this area of the Historic District.

Mr. Phillabaum provided an overview of the applicant's development proposal for this site, including 27 dwelling units, 3,414 square feet of retail uses, 5,000 square feet of restaurant use, and 11,160 square feet of office use, as well as 46 private parking spaces and 89 public parking spaces. He presented site plans and conceptual elevation renderings of the proposed development.

Mr. Hahn asked how the footprint of the project relates to the existing right-of-way. Mr. Phillabaum identified the site boundaries on the plans, but noted that the applicant had not depicted existing rights-of-way of North Blacksmith and North Riverview on the proposal. He stated that the proposal includes angled on-street public parking spaces accessed from North Blacksmith. He continued that the rest of the spaces are accessed from North Riverview, which is at a lower elevation. He said a portion of the parking spaces under the proposed southern building and the spaces along North Riverview were public. He said the private parking is located under the northern building and a portion of the southern building.

Mr. Hahn asked about the purpose of the connector proposed between the two buildings that spans over Wing Hill, and if there are any fire issues with the height. Mr. Phillabaum stated that those are details that would be looked at as this project moves forward.

Lt. DeJarnette asked Mr. Phillabaum to clarify the parking configuration.

Mr. Hahn asked if this project was required to meet the Bridge Street Code.

Mr. Phillabaum said that this project was previously the subject of a Concept Plan Review, which is non-binding. As this is now coming forward after the effective date of the rezoning and adoption of the Bridge Street Code, it would be required to comply. He said that Planning would be conducting a more in-depth analysis of the proposal as it adheres to the Code as part of the Basic Plan Review.

Mr. Hahn asked how close the project was to meeting the Bridge Street Code. Mr. Langworthy said that with a few revisions is could probably get pretty close, once we understand the building type proposed and work through the details when we get to that point.

Mr. Tyler askedabout the process for the Basic Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy instructed the Administrative Review Team to forward comments specific to the demolition and the four demolition criteria to Mr. Phillabaum as soon as possible. He confirmed that there were no further questions regarding this application.

12-061ARTW – Avery Park Water Tower – AT&T Antenna Co-Location – 7699 Avery Road

Rachel Ray commented that this case is scheduled for a decision by the Administrative Review Team (ART) on September 27. She asked the ART members to send any comments or recommended conditions to her to be included in the ART memo for that meeting.

12-0060ARB – MPR – BSC Public District – Dublin Community Church – 81 West Bridge Street

Steve Langworthy asked Rachel Ray to present this application on behalf of the case manager, Jeannie Martin, who was unable to attend this afternoon's Administrative Review Team (ART) meeting.

Rachel Ray said the Dublin Community Church is requesting to install an awning above the main church entrance off the parking lot. She said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G) and under the review standards of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. She reported that the proposed "terra cotta" colored canvas awning will project four feet from the building façade, and is currently shown with a 7.5-foot clearance, where a minimum of 8 feet is required by the Zoning Code.

Ms. Ray said that the proposed Administrative Review Team recommendation to the Architectural Review Board is approval with the following two conditions:

1) The applicant provide details indicating how the awning meets the requirements for wind, lateral loads and live loads as required by Chapter 16 of the Ohio Building Code as well as how the awning will be attached to the building, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official, prior to receiving a building permit; and

2) The awning be installed with a minimum of eight feet of clearance.

Steve Langworthy asked if there was lighting beneath the canopy.

Ms. Ray confirmed that the building egress lighting, currently on the building façade, will be under the canopy.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the applicant had any additional information about the method of attachment for the canopy.

Charles Davis, Dublin Community Church, said he understood that the edges will be caulked to weatherproof the canopy, but he would have to confirm the attachment details with the contractor.

Jeff Tyler commented that stanchions are typically used at the projecting end of the canopy to keep it bolted to withstand wind loads. He said the canopy needs to be able to withstand 90 mile per hour winds, and the applicant will be required to demonstrate that ability at building permitting.

Mr. Langworthy asked Mr. Davis if he agreed with the conditions. [The applicant agreed with the conditions.]

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the Administrative Review Team members had no further comments on this application and stated that the Administrative Review Team will recommend approval with two conditions to the Architectural Review Board for this Minor Project Review application.

Administrative

Mr. Langworthy asked Ms. Ray to provide a brief update regarding potential upcoming applications. He asked Justin Goodwin to provide an overview of a proposal for a development in the West Innovation District.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any changes to the September 6, 2012 meeting minutes. (No changes requested.) Mr. Langworthy accepted the minutes into record as presented.

Steve Langworthy confirmed there were no further items of discussion and adjourned the meeting.